

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**ROBERT W. JOHNSON,**

**Plaintiff,**

**vs.**

**Case No. 2:22-cv-3311**

**Judge Michael H. Watson**

**Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers**

**ROBERT J. YOUNG, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff Robert W. Johnson, a New York resident proceeding without the assistance of counsel, brings this action. (ECF No. 1.) This matter is before the Undersigned for an initial screen of Plaintiff's Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to identify cognizable claims and to recommend dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint, or any portion of it which is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2); *see also McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 608 (6th Cir. 1997).

Having performed the initial screen, for the reasons that follow, it is **RECOMMENDED** that the Court **DISMISS** this action without prejudice and permit him to seek leave to amend.

**I.**

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the federal *in forma pauperis* statute, seeking to "lower judicial access barriers to the indigent." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). In doing so, however, "Congress recognized that 'a litigant whose filing fees and court costs are assumed by the public, unlike a paying litigant, lacks an economic incentive to refrain from filing frivolous, malicious, or repetitive lawsuits.'" *Id.* at 31 (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490

U.S. 319, 324 (1989)). To address this concern, Congress included subsection (e)<sup>1</sup> as part of the statute, which provides in pertinent part:

(2) Notwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have been paid, the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that--

\* \* \*

(B) the action or appeal--

(i) is frivolous or malicious;

(ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or . . . .

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) & (ii); *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 31. Thus, § 1915(e) requires *sua sponte* dismissal of an action upon the Court’s determination that the action is frivolous or malicious, or upon determination that the action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

To properly state a claim upon which relief may be granted, a plaintiff must satisfy the basic federal pleading requirements set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). *See also Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470–71 (6th Cir. 2010) (applying Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) standards to review under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A and 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)). Under Rule 8(a)(2), a complaint must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Thus, Rule 8(a) “imposes legal *and* factual demands on the authors of complaints.” *16630 Southfield Ltd., P’Ship v. Flagstar Bank, F.S.B.*, 727 F.3d 502, 503 (6th Cir. 2013).

Although this pleading standard does not require “‘detailed factual allegations,’ . . . [a] pleading that offers ‘labels and conclusions’ or ‘a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action,’” is insufficient. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic*

---

<sup>1</sup>Formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d).

*Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). A complaint will not “suffice if it tenders ‘naked assertion[s]’ devoid of ‘further factual enhancement.’” *Id.* (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557). Instead, to survive a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6), “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter . . . to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Id.* (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570). Facial plausibility is established “when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* “The plausibility of an inference depends on a host of considerations, including common sense and the strength of competing explanations for the defendant’s conduct.” *Flagstar Bank*, 727 F.3d at 504 (citations omitted). Further, the Court holds *pro se* ain complaints “‘to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.’” *Garrett v. Belmont Cnty. Sheriff’s Dep’t.*, No. 08-3978, 2010 WL 1252923, at \*2 (6th Cir. April 1, 2010) (quoting *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)). This lenient treatment, however, has limits; “‘courts should not have to guess at the nature of the claim asserted.’” *Frengler v. Gen. Motors*, 482 F. App’x 975, 976–77 (6th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Wells v. Brown*, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989)).

Further, when the face of the complaint provides no basis for federal jurisdiction, the Court may dismiss an action as frivolous and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under both 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). *Williams v. Cincy Urban Apts.*, No. 1:10-cv-153, 2010 WL 883846, at \*2 n.1 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 9, 2010) (citing *Carlock v. Williams*, 182 F.3d 916, 1999 WL 454880, at \*2 (6th Cir. June 22, 1999) (table)).

## II.

Plaintiff’s Complaint contains one allegation, in one sentence: that he “was discriminated against and denied employment” by the twelve named Defendants. (ECF No. 1 at

PAGEID # 4.) Plaintiff seeks \$100 million in punitive damages as well as “all other reliefs just and proper.” (*Id.* at PAGEID # 5.)

The Undersigned concludes that Plaintiff has failed to assert a claim upon which relief may be granted in this Court. Even when viewed through the most generous lens, Plaintiff’s Complaint offers nothing more than a legal conclusion – that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff. This is plainly insufficient. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (“A pleading that offers ‘labels and conclusions’ or ‘a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.’”) (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555)); *Gilmore v. Corr. Corp. of Am.*, 92 F. App’x 188, 190 (6th Cir. 2004) (“Merely listing names in the caption of the complaint and alleging constitutional violations in the body of the complaint is not enough to sustain recovery[.]”) (citing *Flagg Bros. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 155–57 (1978)).

Here, Plaintiff does not set forth any of the relevant factual circumstances underlying the alleged discrimination, let alone the basis of the alleged discrimination,<sup>1</sup> leaving the Court without any information to know whether it has jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims,<sup>2</sup> whether Plaintiff’s claims are time-barred, or whether Plaintiff’s claim is even ripe. Accordingly, even under the liberal construction afforded to *pro se* complaints, Plaintiff’s Complaint must be dismissed. *Allah v. Smith*, No. 2:22-CV-21, 2022 WL 394374, at \*4 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 9, 2022) (“[W]here a person is named as a defendant without an allegation of specific conduct, the

---

<sup>1</sup> In order to show a *prima facie* case of discrimination under Title VII, Plaintiff must establish that he was a member of a protected class, he has suffered an adverse employment action, he was qualified for the position, and he was replaced by a person outside the protected class or was treated differently than similarly-situated, non-protected employees. *Briggs v. Univ. of Cincinnati*, 11 F.4th 498, 508 (6th Cir. 2021).

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff affirmatively indicated that his claims do not arise under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3), 1331, or 1332(a)(1), but he did not provide any other basis for subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 1 at PAGEID # 2.)

complaint is subject to dismissal, even under the liberal construction afforded to *pro se* complaints.”) (citing *Catanzaro v. Harry*, 848 F. Supp. 2d 780, 791 (W.D. Mich. 2012)).

That said, given that Plaintiff is proceeding without the assistance of counsel, however, it is **RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff's claim be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. If Plaintiff believes he could amend his Complaint to assert a proper discrimination claim, it is **RECOMMENDED** that he be permitted to move for leave to do so within thirty days of any Order adopting this Report and Recommendation.

### **III.**

For the reasons set forth above, it is **RECOMMENDED** that the Complaint in its entirety be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). It is **FURTHER RECOMMENDED** that if Plaintiff believes he could amend his Complaint to assert a proper discrimination claim, he be permitted to move for leave to file an Amended Complaint within **THIRTY (30) DAYS** of any Order adopting this Report and Recommendation.

### **PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS**

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the Report and Recommendation, specifically designating this Report and Recommendation, and the part in question, as well as the basis for objection. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that the failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and

waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court. *See, e.g., Pfahler v. Nat'l Latex Prod. Co.*, 517 F.3d 816, 829 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding that “failure to object to the magistrate judge’s recommendations constituted a waiver of [the defendant’s] ability to appeal the district court’s ruling”); *United States v. Sullivan*, 431 F.3d 976, 984 (6th Cir. 2005) (holding that defendant waived appeal of district court’s denial of pretrial motion by failing to timely object to magistrate judge’s report and recommendation). Even when timely objections are filed, appellate review of issues not raised in those objections is waived. *Robert v. Tesson*, 507 F.3d 981, 994 (6th Cir. 2007) (“[A] general objection to a magistrate judge’s report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not suffice to preserve an issue for appeal . . .”) (citation omitted)).

**DATED: September 20, 2022**

/s/ Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers  
**ELIZABETH A. PRESTON DEAVERS**  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**